



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,773	12/11/2001	Hannu Kontinen	413-010727-US(PAR)	9944

2512 7590 08/23/2005

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/014,773

Applicant(s)

KONTTINEN, HANNU

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 6/2/05. The application claims the foreign priority date 12/15/2000 in accordance with foreign priority papers filed 12/11/2001.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, and 14, are independent claims.
3. Claims 1-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warnock have been withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warnock et al., USPN 5,634,064 filed (8/2/1996) in view of Bricklin et al., USPN 6,928,609 filed (1/16/2001).**

In reference to independent claim 1, Warnock teaches:

Once a source document has been created, it is converted into a Portable Document Format (PDF) document, which has the formatting and appearance of the originally created document (compare to "*the said pages are preprocessed in order to read the text portion in them*"). See column 5, lines 45-67. The applicant is reminded that the claims limitations are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art. Without any

Art Unit: 2178

explanation as to how the preprocessing is occurring, the limitation fails to preclude the Examiner from utilizing the conversion of source document into PDF documents to read text portions within the document as a preprocessing step.

After the article sections have been selected and linked, a window is provided for the entry of article properties. More specifically, window allows the title, subject, author, and key words pertaining to the article to be entered into the viewing system (compare to “the text is searched for a start element and an end element”). See column 8, lines 1-20. The limitation fails to mention how the text is searched and what constitutes a start element and end element. Again, the broad nature of the term start element and end element within the limitations of the claim could be described by any word, sentence, paragraph, or link found within a document. Therefore, the first paragraph would constitute a start and end element.

One type of scroll is the normal page scroll which allows a reader to scroll around in the current page. This is typically controlled by the computer’s operating system or the presentation manager (compare to “a new start element and end element are searched for if the user gives a shift command”). See column 9, lines 40-67. The scrolling mechanism allows the user to shift through the document based on simple keyboard features. The reference fails to explicitly state the shift key; however, the scrolling mechanism provides a similar result. Furthermore, the reference discloses the employment of a hot key for providing article properties. The utilization of the shift key to implement the functions of a hot key was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the scrolling mechanism and the hot keys as a

Art Unit: 2178

method to shift through any type of PDF document for easy access to various parts of the document and proficient presentation of PDF documents.

The reference provides a display window, however, Warnock fails to explicitly divide the preprocessed document into various display windows. Bricklin describes a document presented in multiple windows for multiple views. The display screens shown in 17a and 17b both include a contents map window, a lexia display window, a navigational window, and a scrolling frame. Furthermore, the reference contains a search function that allows searches to be made of the content of each of the lexia of a hypermedia work. For example, a search can be limited to the non-displayed nicknames of lexia, or to nicknames and summaries, or to titles and displayed content. Text searches could also be performed by the present invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the multiple display methods taught by Bricklin with the single display methods of Warnock because it would have given the author added windows for enhanced editing features and organization of document data through the use of a navigational window, a contents map window, and a lexia window.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Warnock teaches:

Throughout the specification the expression “layout” and “format” are used somewhat interchangeably to denote the process of determining a particular physical relationship and appearance for document content information. For example, layout and format information determine line breaks, hyphenation, and justification for text. See column 6, lines 23-45.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Warnock teaches:

Throughout the specification the expression “layout” and “format” are used somewhat interchangeably to denote the process of determining a particular physical relationship and

Art Unit: 2178

appearance for document content information. For example, layout and format information determine line breaks, hyphenation, and justification for text. See column 6, lines 23-45.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Warnock teaches:

If the system detects a page scroll, a scroll command is generated and the user is allowed to scroll within the page. This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard horizontal and vertical scroll bars provided. See column 9, lines 40-57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to have utilized the scroll mechanism to access one step forward, one step backward, to the beginning of next paragraph, etc. because it would have given the user a proficient means for viewing any part of the document utilizing the horizontal and vertical scroll bars.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Warnock teaches:

If the system detects a page scroll, a scroll command is generated and the user is allowed to scroll within the page. This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard horizontal and vertical scroll bars provided. See column 9, lines 40-57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to have utilized the scroll mechanism to access one step forward, one step backward, to the beginning of next paragraph, etc. because it would have given the user a proficient means for viewing any part of the document utilizing the horizontal and vertical scroll bars.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Warnock teaches:

It should be noted that this new portion of the article is automatically panned and zoomed to fit within the article view area of the window, as with the previous article section, to enhance readability. See column 9, lines 50-55.

Art Unit: 2178

In reference to dependent claim 7, Warnock teaches:

Once a source document has been created, it is converted into a Portable Document Format (PDF) document, which has the formatting and appearance of the originally created document (compare to “*the said pages are preprocessed in order to read the text portion in them*”). See column 5, lines 45-67. The applicant is reminded that the claims limitations are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art. Without any explanation as to how the preprocessing is occurring, the limitation fails to preclude the Examiner from utilizing the conversion of source document into PDF documents to read text portions within the document.

It should be noted that this new portion of the article is automatically panned and zoomed to fit within the article view area of the window, as with the previous article section, to enhance readability (compare to “*a means for dividing the display into a navigation page and read pane and for bringing an overall view of the received pages in the navigation pane*”). See column 9, lines 50-55.

If the system detects a page scroll, a scroll command is generated and the user is allowed to scroll within the page. This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard horizontal and vertical scroll bars provided (compare to “*selecting the reading portion comprising a program arranged to find a start and end point for the reading portion on the basis of rules of a selected language and to change reading portions according to user commands*”). See column 9, lines 40-57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to have utilized the scroll mechanism to access one step forward, one step backward, to the beginning of next paragraph, etc. because it would have

given the user a proficient means for viewing any part of the document utilizing the horizontal and vertical scroll bars.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Wornock teaches:

This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard horizontal and vertical scroll bars provided. See column 9, lines 55-67.

In reference to dependent claim 9, Wornock teaches:

A hyperlink from another application program could be used to launch the article-reading mode. See column 10, lines 45-50.

In reference to dependent claims 10-14, the limitations recite instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1-9, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. In response to applicant's amendment filed on June 2, 2005, the examiner believes the argument regarding the preprocessing of hypertext pages is not persuasive. The limitation fails to preclude the Examiner from utilizing the conversion of source document into PDF documents to read text portions within the document as a preprocessing step. Once a source document has been created as taught by Warnock, it is converted into a Portable Document Format (PDF) document, which has the formatting and appearance of the originally created document.

The applicant argues on page 6 of the amendment that Warnock fails to teach the selection of start and end elements to define hypertext. The examiner believes the applicant is arguing a limitation, 'selection of start and end elements to define hypertext to be displayed in the read pane', which could not be found within the limitations of the claim. Based on the

limitation, 'searching the text for a start element and end element', the examiner could interpret that as any piece of text, link, sentence, paragraph, title, etc.

Finally, the newly added subject matter added to the independent claim changes the scope of the claim when read as a whole. Therefore, the Bricklin reference has been added to provide a multiple window view of data and a searching method that could also be interpreted as a method based on text, title, link, i.e. a start element and end element.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML

August 18, 2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/18/2005